



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,677	12/19/2003	Robert Katta	042933/271714	4167
826	7590	04/17/2007	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			ALAM, SHAHID AL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/741,677	KATTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shahid Al Alam	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8, 16-18 and 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 – 4, 9 – 10, 12 – 15, 19 – 20 and 25 – 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 4, 9 – 15, 19 – 21 and 25 – 38 are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed January 29, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 – 4, 9 – 15, 19 – 21 and 25 – 38 under Chakrabarti have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Mahoney.

Applicants arguing that there is no teaching or suggestion in Chakrabarti relating to information in each segment of the derived segment corresponding to current information at the network resource from which the segment was derived.

Since, the specification does not explicitly described segment, network resource, the examiner interpreted the claim language in light of the specification by giving the broadest interpretation.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 – 4, 9 – 10, 12 – 15, 19 – 20 and 25 – 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,389,436 issued to Soumen Chakrabarti ("Chakrabarti") and in view of U.S. Patent Number John J. Mahoney et al. ("Mahoney").

With respect to claim 1, Chakrabarti teaches segmenting information (classify documents that contains hyperlinks) on a network resource (column 5, lines 46 – 53 and Figure 1) to define segments of derivable content; selecting

one or more segments of derivable content; and assigning a plurality of identifying attributes to each selected segment of derivable content (*When a new document is to be classified in a neighborhood, the hypertext classifier processes the new document and all documents in a neighborhood around the document through a text-based classifier. The hypertext classifier identifies the neighborhood of the new document to be classified. . . . all documents containing hyperlinks that points to the new document; see column 6, lines 28 – 42. see also Figure 11, items [1102: document to be classified and 1104: classified document]).*

Chakrabarti teaches segmenting a Web page into intervals and separated into segments (column 25, lines 23 – 31), classifier is permitted to explore (access) any neighborhood of the sample (column 15, lines 61 – 65), the classifier uses features directly or derived from the neighborhood to classify the text document (column 16, lines 5 – 8).

Chakrabarti does not explicitly teach permitting access to the selected segments of derivable content as claimed.

Mahoney teaches claimed permitting access to the selected segments of derivable content (column 6, lines 41 – 58: each user has authorization to access all or a subset of the information stored at the repository server. Thus, different users may be permitted to access different subsets of the documents stored at the central repository. Each corporation submitting corporate information has the option of specifying those users or classes of users who are authorized to access that item of information. Additionally, an item of corporate information can be

divided into parts or pages, and different users permitted to access different parts or pages of the information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chakrabarti with the teachings of Mahoney to allow remote users to receive, access and query corporate information in electronic form and also to allow corporations to control their content and format and at the same time enable users to easily locate desired information (column 3, lines 49 – 50 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

As to claim 2, instructions for segmenting information on a network resource at various levels of segmentation to allow a user to identify a segment that includes desired derivable content (Chakrabarti: Figure 2, item 200; Identify Documents).

As to claim 3, the identifying attributes as an identifying attribute chosen from the group consisting of content of the segment, relation of the segment to other objects, and the structure of the network resource (Chakrabarti: Figure 2, item 204; Identify a class for Each Document).

As to claim 4, provides for network-user input to the assigning of the plurality of identifying attributes (Chakrabarti: Figure 2, item 206; Identified Classes).

As to claim 25, the network resource comprises a web page (Chakrabarti: column 1, lines 18 – 22).

As to claim 26, the derivable content comprises one or more portions of information on the web page (Chakrabarti: column 1, lines 18 – 22).

As to claim 35, the segmenting information comprises information relating to at least one of an index, byte size and a number of segment counts (Chakrabarti: Figure 7 and column 20, lines 29 – 38).

4. The subject matters of claims 9 – 11, 27 – 29 and 36 are rejected in the analysis above in claims 1 – 4, 25, 26 and 35 and these claims are rejected on that basis.

5. Claims 12 – 15, 30, 31 and 37 are essentially the same as claims 1 – 4, 25, 26 and 35 above except that it set forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a computer program product and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

6. Claims 19 – 25, 32 – 34 and 38 are essentially the same as claims 1 – 4, 25, 26 and 35 above except that it set forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a computer program product and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 11 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a):

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Al Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-4030. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00 A.M.- 4:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Shahid Al Alam
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162

April 15, 2007